



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

CHARITIES AND TRUSTS FOR CHARITABLE USES — WHAT CONSTITUTES CHARITIES — BEQUEST FOR MASSES. — The testator in his will bequeathed sums of money to religious bodies for the celebration of masses. *Held*, that such gifts are not illegal. *Bourne v. Keane*, [1919] A. C. 815 (House of Lords).

The validity of a bequest for masses is sustained or denied in different jurisdictions on varying grounds. One view, maintained by an increasing number of courts, holds that such a gift establishes a valid charitable trust. *Schouler, Petitioner*, 134 Mass. 426; *Gilmore v. Lee*, 237 Ill. 433, 86 N. E. 568; *Webster v. Sughrow*, 69 N. H. 380, 45 Atl. 139. The celebration of masses is publicly conducted and therefore the benefit conferred is not confined solely to that received by the testator. Some courts uphold the gift as a private trust which may not extend beyond the period of perpetuities. *Re Zeagman*, 37 Ont. L. Rep. 536. See *Kehoe v. Wilson*, 7 L. R. Ir. 10, 16. New York and other states hold that a private trust is attempted which fails, however, under the doctrine of *Morice v. Bishop of Durham*, for lack of a definite beneficiary. *Holland v. Alcock*, 108 N. Y. 312, 15 N. E. 302; *Festorazzi v. St. Joseph's Catholic Church*, 104 Ala. 327, 18 So. 394. But see *In re Eppig's Estate*, 63 Misc. 613, 118 N. Y. Supp. 683. Still a fourth view regards the bequest, if made to a specific priest, as a gift, conditioned upon the requested services being performed. *Sherman v. Baker*, 20 R. I. 449, 40 Atl. 11; *Harrison v. Brophy*, 59 Kan. 1, 51 Pac. 883. In England, however, on the basis of an early statute these trusts were held illegal as a superstitious use. *Adam's & Lambert's Case*, 4 Coke, 104 b. See 1 EDW. VI, c. 14. See also DUKE, CHARITABLE USES, 126. And they were so held even after the passage of Catholic relief acts. *West v. Shuttleworth*, 2 Myl. & K. 684; *Heath v. Chapman*, 2 Drew. 413. In the principal case, however, the House of Lords overrules a long line of decisions and holds that a bequest for masses is not illegal, though it is left undecided whether it is charitable or not. This decision, coupled with a late case, in which the House of Lords sustained a trust to promote atheism, indicates an increasingly liberal attitude of the English judiciary towards free religious belief. See *Bowman v. Secular Society*, [1917] A. C. 406; 31 HARV. L. REV. 289.

CHARITIES AND TRUSTS FOR CHARITABLE USES — WHAT CONSTITUTE CHARITIES — BEQUEST FOR THE BENEFIT OF "DESERVING" MEMBERS OF A SPECIFIED RELIGIOUS CREED UPON MARRIAGE. — A testator directed his trustees to invest £2000 in their names in certain securities, and "once in every three years from my decease select at their absolute discretion a deserving Jewish girl, giving the preference to relations of mine, and to pay to such selected girl on her marriage the income from the securities." A summons raised the question whether such a bequest is charitable. *Held*, that it is. *In re Cohen*, 36 T. L. R. 16.

The court in the principal case supported the bequest on the ground that it tended to encourage marriage among Jews, and that it was for the benefit of the Jewish religion. The statute 43 Elizabeth, c. 4, is generally considered, as broadly defining what purposes are charitable. See *Morice v. Bishop of Durham*, 9 Ves. 399, 405. See also 29 HARV. L. REV. 793. A gift for the encouragement of marriage, even among members of a particular race or creed, is not found within the terms of that statute, and, it would seem, is not embraced within the spirit of it. It is difficult to support the bequest as a gift for a religious purpose, since the benefit to the Jewish religion from the trust is too remote. Cf. *Laverty v. Laverty*, [1907] 1 I. R. 9. See also *Hester v. Hester*, 2 Ired. Eq. (N. C.) 330, 340. Religious purposes are charitable only when they tend directly or indirectly toward the instruction or edification of the public. *Cocks v. Manners*, L. R. 12 Eq. 574. See TUDOR, CHARITABLE TRUSTS, 3 ed., 9. But the decision might be supported on the ground that there is a trust for the relief of poverty. Though the term "deserving" does not necessarily mean "poor," it might well